

## **APPENDIX – I.**

### **Framing Questions**

#### **From Cynthia and Bert's discussion in June**

- What can we practically move ahead on:  
Easy - Middle - difficult?
- How can we address the issues of industry in a way that is informed by staff wisdom regarding protection of the environment?
- How can we address the issues of staff with program and function?
- What do you think about:
  - Regulatory Relief?
  - Streamlining?
  - Voluntary Compliance?
- What are the pieces of the puzzle / a la the Air Matrix?

---

#### **Susan's Puntillo suggestions**

1. What Changes are you aware of in industry, technology or business needs that would be better accommodated by changes in either structure or process?
2. Where should our program be 5 years from now?
3. What kind of support systems do you need to be successful?
4. How will you judge if we are successful?
  - What do you consider a successful program?
  - What do you think industry would consider a successful program?
  - What do you think environmentalists would consider a successful program?

#### Added suggestions from first session

- What do you think resident/neighbors would consider a successful program?
  - What do you think future state residents will consider a successful program?
5. What are some things that are still part of statutes and no longer work but which have never been changed?

## **APPENDIX – II.**

### **Strategic Questions**

What are those one, two, or three things that if we do them skillfully, everything else we try to do will have a better chance of success?

What are those one, two, or three things that if we do not address them skillfully, everything else we try to do will be at a significantly greater risk of failure?

## **APPENDIX – III.**

### **Questions as originally framed and as framed by Appreciative Inquiry Principles.**

- A. How do we maintain integrity while acknowledging and addressing the comfort level of those being regulated?
- B. Recall a time when you have maintained your integrity as a protector of the environment and addressed the comfort level of those being regulated.
  - What was that like?
  - Who else was involved?
  - Describe how it felt.
- A. How do we balance technology and the needs of industry as we do our job of protecting the environment?
- B. Recall a time when you were able to balance technology and the needs of industry as you did your job of protecting the environment.
  - What was that like?
  - Who else was involved?
  - Describe how it felt.
- A. What can we do to do our job effectively with diminishing resources?
- B. Recall a time when you were able to do an effective job with diminishing resources.
  - What was that like?
  - Who else was involved?
  - Describe how it felt.
- A. What would you like to download about past stress and disappointment in DNR reorganization processes?
- B. Recall a time when you were able to effectively manage the stress and disappointment of DNR reorganization processes and do your work productively.
  - What was that like?
  - Who else was involved?
  - Describe how it felt.

- A. What should we avoid as we re-organize?
- B. Recall a time when you have been involved in a reorganization process where threatening pitfalls were successfully avoided.
  - What was that like?
  - Who else was involved?
  - Describe how it felt.
- A. What do you think makes a good experience for staff input to decision makers?
- B. Recall a time when you have had a satisfying experience as a staff person providing input to decision makers.
  - What was that like?
  - Who else was involved?
  - Describe how it felt.

## Success / Three Wishes

- A. What will success look like in the Bureau of Waste Management Innovations of approach to applying current technology within the law we are employed to enforce?
- B. What three wishes would you make to heighten the vitality and health of the innovations in our approach to applying current technology within the laws we are employed to enforce.
- A. What will success look like in our proactive control of the innovation processes?
- B. What three wishes would you make to heighten the vitality and health of our proactive control of the innovation processes?
- A. What will success look like in healing the wounds of the past?
- B. What three wishes would you make to heighten the vitality and health of the process in dealing with the wounds of the past?
- A. What will a successful redesign look like?
- B. What three wishes would you make for a successful program redesign?

## **APPENDIX – IV.**

Three Basic Elements of Appreciative Inquiry:

### **The Nature of Assumptions in a Group**

Assumptions are statements or rules that explain what a group generally believe.

Assumptions explain the context of the group's choices and behaviors.

Assumptions are usually not visible to or verbalized by the participants/members; rather they develop and exist.

Assumptions must be made visible and discussed before anyone can be sure of the group beliefs

The Thin Book

## Assumptions of Appreciative Inquiry

1. In every society, organization, or group, something works.
2. What we focus on becomes our reality.
3. Reality is created in the moment, and there are multiple realities.
4. The act of asking questions of an organization or group influences the group in some way.
5. People have more confidence and comfort to journey to the future (the unknown) when they carry forward parts of the past (the known).
6. If we carry part of the past forward, they should be what is best about the past
7. It is important to value differences
8. The language we use creates our reality.

### **The Thin Book**

## Six Core Principles of Appreciative Inquiry

### **The Constructionist Principle:**

An organization's destiny is bound up in people's understanding of it. The first task in changing an organization is to discover what its people think about it.

### **The Principle of Simultaneity:**

The process of inquiry itself influences the direction of change.

### **The Anticipatory Principle:**

The most powerful vehicle for improving an organization is the collective imagination about its future, about what it is becoming.

### **The Poetic Principle:**

Everyone within the organization and everyone who interacts with it are constantly rewriting an organization's "story". The organization, like a poem, is constantly being interpreted and reinterpreted.

### **The Positive Principle:**

An inquiry based on the positive – achievement, joy, hope, and inspiration – works better than an analysis of what is wrong and how it can be cured.

### **The Participatory Principle**

Lasting organizational change depends on the participation of everyone in an organization.

## APPENDIX – V.

### Better Meeting Practices:

## The Round

The Round is a discipline that can greatly enhance the productivity of a meeting:

- It provides an opportunity for all voices to be heard.
- It reduces domination of discussions.
- It reveals the mind of the group in that moment.
- It helps the group consider the implications of their mind sets.
- It promotes listening.
- It helps to develop consensus.

## Uses for the Round

- **Opening Check in:** Very often members of a group have things on their mind which have nothing to do with the meeting they are in but have everything to do with their mental and emotional state. It will help the meeting if those present know joys and sorrows. This way members can take into account the otherwise Unexplained reactions of their colleagues. **Sometimes** it is helpful to do a second check-in round that is more focused on reports of still deeper emotional states of the members. This is when anger and frustration with some aspect of life or the project at hand can be vented. **In groups where some or all people are new** it will be very helpful if everyone present knows who everyone else is and what they represent. For example if a newspaper reporter is present, everyone should know that.
- **Open up discussion on a focused subject:** It will help to expedite the discussion if it starts from a place of knowing every participant's take on the matter. It will also help to keep the discussion focused on the matter at hand and avoid tangents.
- **Open up discussion in order to find focus when several items are requiring attention:** Often we come into meetings where the agenda is loaded and even within individual agenda items there may be many areas to cover. The round can serve to establish the priorities of the group thus avoiding overriding anxiety that occurs when less critical items dominate the discussion.



- **Discover consensus of the group regarding a question:** A round or two can efficiently process the nuances of opinion into a decision which demonstrates the mind of the group.
- **Provide a safe place** for individuals to speak who otherwise would be intimidated. Also effective when a topic is emotionally loaded.
- **Reestablish Focus**  
Very often groups lose their focus. A round will help to get back on track.
- **Build a discussion:** As people speak the next person seeks to add their own thoughts to the ideas that have been stated before so as to 'build' the discussion toward a conclusion.
- **Closing Check out:** It will improve the group's team spirit if at the end of each session each person relates what went well for them during the meeting and what did not go well. It can also be helpful for each member to comment on how they individually did in the meeting and ask for feedback from other members.

## Rules of the Round

- **Each person speaks in turn, one at a time:** This understanding insures to each member present that they will have an opportunity to be heard.
- **Individuals are allowed to pass:** This reassures each member that speaking is at their prerogative.
- **Paradoxically it is important that all members speak:** Paradox is a fact of life and it helps if we acknowledge this fact. While permission to pass is honored, 'withholding' or 'holding out to see how the wind blows' are disruptive to productive discussion.
- **Speak from the heart:** Speak your truth. Speak even if your voice is shaking / Speak especially if your voice is shaking. Speak with accountability and respect.
- **There is no cross talk:** As each member speaks other members do not respond with comments or questions.
- **There are no side conversations:** As each member speaks all other members remain silent and do not speak to their neighbors.
- **Avoid airtime:** Tell your story briefly. Make your point or points and then stop talking. Long-winded rationalizations, stories of the past, and irrelevant sidebars do not add to the group's ability to stay focused.
- **Speak your truth:** The discussion will be more productive if members state as clearly as possible exactly what is on their mind.

- **Listen to completion:** A very difficult part of communication is listening to and hearing the other person completely without indulging our own thought process. We often race forward to create our response while the other person is still speaking. It sometimes helps to wait briefly after we think the other person has stopped and then ask them if they are 'complete'. We often use a 'stop' when a breath is taken to immediately start our 'response' not realizing we have cut the other person off.
- **Do not attack other members** of the group verbally or otherwise. The Round is a 'safe place'.
- **Ask one to three people in the group, preferably not the leader, to summarize the outcome of the round:** It will increase team spirit if the meeting is not dominated by the chair. It will help the group to have a sense of how the discussion went. With two or three summaries the group will have a better sense of their complete discussion.
- **Allow for some discussion to achieve consensus on the summary:** By seeking consensus on the summary the group will come closer faster to consensus on the issue or subject before them.

## APPENDIX – VI.

### Post Focus Group Email Contributions

The following information came in after session. Participants were invited to send in additional thoughts anonymously for inclusion as appendix to this report without any effort to incorporate it, edit it, or otherwise comment on it.

#### EMAIL 1:

Thoughts and comments that I think are relevant to the redesign session of July 7<sup>th</sup>:

- A. A group effort (staff + management) to identify the waste program's constituencies and discuss their relative importance may be helpful for all involved.
- B. Moving toward larger landfills (through longer leachate lines and a potential 25-year site life) leads to: increased complexity in landfill design, construction, and operation; increased risk to the environment; increased financial risk to the State and its citizens; increased amounts of out-of-state waste; potential lengthened duration of the operational period at landfills; potential adverse affects on recycling rates; potential reduced disposal costs at landfills; a potential limiting of the distribution of landfills across the landscape. An open discussion on such issues and the direction of the program would be beneficial.
- C. What is the import of the program's EMS certification and how are the goals that came out of the EMS process being incorporated into the program's operation, direction, vision, and planning?
- D. What is the effect of increasing amounts of out-of-state waste coming to WI on the program? What should it be?
- E. What is the effect of low tipping costs in the state on the program? What should it be?
- F. What are the effects of the waste industry consolidation and the resulting high debt loads of the four (inter)national companies operating here on the program? What should it be?
- G. Proposed statutory change: more realistic review times for all parts of the permitting process for landfills larger than 1 million cu yds - these are complex sites requiring detailed reviews.

## EMAIL 2

I am a staff person with a long history in the Waste program. I believe that our primary constituents are the environment and the future residents of Wisconsin. We should not give preference to certain large waste disposal companies just because they are businesses...we serve a lot more companies and non-profits (like counties) than just the big 4 companies. Catering to big companies could squeeze out a lot of small to mid-size companies that would employ as many or even more people than the big companies.

To manage Wisconsin's waste effectively, like a lot of things, we need three-legged stool; strong businesses (of all sizes), strong consultants and strong regulators are all necessary or the system will fall down.

Whatever structure we create should protect the environment by managing our resources effectively and efficiently. If we review plans and respond to current issues in a timely, consistent manner, then Waste companies and the public will have less to complain about. This is something entirely within our control (unlike the political environment) and we would do better to focus on that than on pleasing a few customers.

We need to create a structure that supports and encourages consistency, or we will lose even more respect from waste management companies and the public alike and the program will continue to stumble. Some ideas I have for improving consistency are:

- A. Have all technical plan review work reviewed by at least one technical person other than the initial reviewer, for statewide consistency.
- B. Regional staff can and maybe should be supervised by regional supervisors for administrative things like sick leave, etc. but those supervisors should assign work in consultation with technical supervisors to even out the workload among plan reviewers statewide.
- C. Certain specialized topics should have one or two persons who review all draft plan reviews statewide. For example, an experienced engineer could review all draft PLOP approvals, an experienced hydro could review all feasibility approvals, another could review all NR 140-related decisions, landfill closure plan approvals, one-time disposal approvals, etc. I don't care if the expert is in the central office or regions. It might be better to have a mix of CO and Regional staff experts, to relieve some of the CO/Regional animosity.
- D. Certain types of plan reviews, for which there are few per year, should all be assigned to the same person, regardless of what region the project and reviewer are in. One person could review all the PLOPs for infectious waste storage facilities, for example.
- E. The designated signers of approvals should be REQUIRED to ascertain that the statewide expert actually did review the draft and that his/her comments were incorporated, before signing the approval.

- F. The program should retain and hire more support staff so that technical staff can do what they are trained to do (review plans) instead of spending time inspecting landfills, filing, issuing routine letters, handling complaints, etc. Then plan reviewers can be more consistent in what they do.
- G. Plan reviewers and supervisors alike should never allow things prohibited by state law, just to get projects off the backlog list. If we don't follow state regulations, who else should?
- H. Plan review staff should have regular face-to-face meetings to discuss current issues. We should not have to do this on our lunch hours. They could be "Consistency Building" meetings to elevate importance.
- I. The program should continue to try to put all public guidance into a standard format on the web and gather its informal knowledge into the Consistency Library. To elevate this in importance, someone should be assigned to do this.
- J. The presumption that "plan review must remain decentralized" is a sacred cow. This presumption should be questioned in an era when budgets are so tight. Businesses consolidate in lean times and they should and would understand that we are trying to give them the best service we can given the resources we have. If we can't move the bodies back to one location, at least we can centralize the supervisory functions of reviewing drafts and assigning work.
- K. We need to continue to hold consultants and businesses accountable for turning in complete plans. If there is a completeness checklist published and items are missing, maybe we could charge for each item that is incomplete.
- L. While we can trust some companies to "do the right thing" we can't trust all of them. Generally we know who we can trust and who we can't. We will always need plan reviewers to catch those that write reports that look/sound good but are inadequate.
- M. I support a central office structure that makes a supervisor responsible and accountable for coordinating each of our major program areas: solid waste, hazardous waste and recycling. Minor program areas like tires, mining, medical waste and others, can be assigned to those same section chiefs. At a minimum, the solid waste section chief should be someone intimately familiar with plan review and technical issues.
- N. I do like the existing teams. The environmental monitoring and special waste teams should be retained even if the HW and SW teams are disbanded by being in the HW and SW sections.
- O. All teams should have permanent team leaders so they can focus on accomplishing program work and not just administration of the team.

Some of the above suggestions, like designating experts to review draft plan approvals statewide and gathering all our guidance onto the Internet and Intranet, should be implemented immediately.